REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-30 are pending. In the office action, all pending claims are rejected.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 15 and 22-30.

Claims 1, 15, 22, 23 and 25 have been amended to include the limitation that the motion compensation is used in compression of the video sequence. The support can be found in Figure 7, blocks 26, 24 and 26.

Claim 15 has also been amended to claim an apparatus instead of a video editing device.

Claim 23 has also been amended to change "module" into "means".

Claims 24-30 have been amended to claim a computer readable medium embedded with a software program.

No new matter has been introduced.

Double Patenting

At page 3 of the office action, claims 1-3, 11-12, 15-18, 23 and 24 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over a copending application No. 10/737,184.

Applicant has submitted herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.321(c) in order to overcome the provisional rejection.

Claim Rejections Under Section 101

At page 4 of the office action, claims 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for claiming a non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 24-30 to claim a computer readable medium as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under Section 102

At page 5, claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Chang et al.* (IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, Vol. 13, No. 1, January 1995, 0733-8716/955, "Manipulation and Composing of MC-DCT Compressed Video, hereafter referred to as *Chang*).

The Examiner states that *Chang* disclose a video editing method as claimed. In particular, the Examiner points to p.2, col.1, paragraph 1 of *Chang* for disclosing "we derive

9

one set of algorithms to perform all above mention manipulations in the transform domain",
and mentioning "DCT coefficients" in p.7, section VI.A).

Chang mentions "After video signals are compressed, there are still many situations
where further manipulations of such compressed video are needed" (p.1, col.1, section I); "we
can derive equivalent manipulation algorithm in the compressed domain and manipulation
video directly in the compressed domain [4]-[6], [32] (p.1, col.2, second paragraph); "we derive
one set of algorithm to perform all above-mentioned manipulations in the transform domain, in
which video signals are represented by transform coefficients (such as quantized DCT
coefficients) [5] (p.2, col.1, first paragraph); "The DCT or DCT-compressed domain refers to
the quantized DCT coefficients, which can be obtained after the inverse quantizer in the
decoder of Fig.2 (p.2, col.2, second paragraph).

In all the above-mentioned methods for video manipulation in the DCT domain, *Chang*
performs DCT transformation on pixels (Eq.2) and blocks of pixels (Eq.7), Eqs. 9-11, 13.
Thus, the above-mentioned methods are different from the claimed invention in which the
transform coefficients are acquired from a bitstream carrying video data and the acquiring step
may comprise decoding the bitstream for obtaining a plurality of quantized transform
coefficients and converting the quantized transform coefficients by inverse quantization.
Chang also discloses the manipulation of MC-compressed video in which MC-DCT video is
decoded (p.6, col.2 to p.7, col.1, section V). In particular, *Chang* discloses a decoding method
where the MC part is decoded first and then the DCT part (see Figure 7, and Eqs.17-18).

Thus, *Chang* only discloses a compressed domain approach for manipulating video data
in a compressed domain, and not in a transform domain. In particular, *Chang* takes the
modifications to the compressed domain using the linearity of the DCT.

In contrast, the claimed invention is concerned with transform domain editing of video
data. *Chang* does not disclose transform domain editing of video data.

For the above reasons, *Chang* fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-30 are allowable. Early allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith R. Obert
Registration No. 58,051

Date: 27 December 2007

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
 & ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building 5
755 Main Street, PO Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234